



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,336	02/13/2002	Kenneth Charles Boydston	1560(4000-03400)	8714
28003	7590	05/16/2005	EXAMINER	
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100				GREENE, DANIEL L
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3621		

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/075,336	BOYDSTUN ET AL.
	Examiner Daniel L. Greene	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2002.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the illustrations are hand numbered. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Dyke et al. U.S. Patent 5,708,812 [Van Dyke], and further in view of Mehring et al. U.S. Patent 6,609,115 B1 [Mehring]

As per claims 1, 16 and 22:

Van Dyke discloses:

Receive identification from a user seeking access to information protected by the target user authenticator. Col. 16, lines 55-67. As per, Col. 16, lines 55-67, Van Dyke teaches receiving identification from a user seeking access to information protected by the target user authenticator by authenticating the user request during the migration stage.

Locate the corresponding identification in the target datastore and determine whether the target datastore includes a password associated with the identification. Col. 17, lines 1-20. As per, Col. 17, lines 1-20, Van Dyke teaches locating the corresponding identification in the target datastore, which includes a password, associated with the user's identification.

Receive a password from the user associated with the received identification; Col. 16, lines 55-67. As per Col. 16, lines 55-67, Van Dyke teaches, receiving a password from the user associated with the received identification.

Van Dyke does not expressly show, read selected unencrypted data from source datastore; convert unencrypted data to be compatible with target datastore; and populate target datastore with the converted data.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The migration steps, taught by Van Dyke, teach about the migration of data from a Source Domain to a Target Domain. Col. 12, lines 20-60, would be performed the same regardless of the data.

Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to read selected data be it unencrypted or encrypted data from source datastore; convert unencrypted/encrypted data to be compatible with target datastore; and populate target datastore with the converted data, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention except for if the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification, then submits the received identification and received password to the source user authenticator.

Mehring teaches that it is known in the art to provide if the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification, then submit the received identification and received password to the source user authenticator. Col. 10, lines 49-67, Col. 11, lines 1-10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the authentication procedure Van Dyke with the if the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification, then submit the received identification and received password to the source user authenticator of Mehring, in order to facilitate the use of the data during the migration phase of the data transfer.

Further , it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to if the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification, then submit the received identification and received password to the source user authenticator since it is known in the art that during a data base migration period, if the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification, then submit the received identification and received password to the source user authenticator.

Monitor the source user authenticator for an approval response; Col. 17, lines 1-29. Van Dyke teaches about recognizing and waiting for the returned context.

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention except for on receipt of an approval response from the source user authenticator populates the target datastore with the received password associating the received password with the corresponding identification. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to on receipt of an approval response from the source user authenticator populate the target datastore with the received password associating the received password with the corresponding identification, since it is known in the art that to facilitate the complete transfer of data, when data is found missing from the original source, it is restored by the data from the original source.

Authenticate the identification and password using the target user authenticator. Col. 16, lines 60-67. Van Dyke discloses the logging on and the responding to the logon request.

As per claim 2:

Van Dyke further discloses:

If, after determining whether the target datastore includes a password associated with the identification, the target datastore does include a password associated with the identification, then authenticate the identification and password using the target user authenticator. Col. 7, lines 15-20.

As per claim 3:

Van Dyke further discloses:

Receiving a password in a single submission from the user in conjunction with receiving the identification from the user. Col. 16, lines 55-67.

As per claims 4, 5, 17, 20 and 23:

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention except for the receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user. However, Van Dyke does disclose the use of a password and a corresponding unique account identification number. Col. 7, lines 15-20. Mehring teaches that it is known in the art to provide a receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user. Col. 10, lines 60-67. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the password/unique identification element of Van Dyke with the receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user of Mehring, in order to increase the security in accessing data. Further, it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Van Dyke, to provide the step of receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

Since the applicant has not disclosed that receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user, solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Van Dyke will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to receiving a password in a submission from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

As per claims 6, 18, 21 and 24:

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user. It would have been an obvious to modify the teachings of Van Dyke to provide the step of prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

Since the applicant has not disclosed that prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Van Dyke will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

As per claims 7:

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention except for the wherein the action of prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user occurs after determining that the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification; and,

wherein the action further comprises using the source user authenticator to prompt for and receive the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

Mehring teaches that it is known in the art to provide wherein the action of prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user occurs after determining that the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification; and, wherein the action further comprises using the source user authenticator to prompt for and receive the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the security method of Van Dyke with wherein the action of prompting for and receiving the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user occurs after determining that the target datastore does not include a password associated with the identification; and, wherein the action further comprises using the source user authenticator to prompt for and receive the identification and a password from the user after the initial submission of the identification from the user of Mehring, in order to authenticate the user requesting the data.

As per claims 8 and 9:

Van Dyke discloses the claimed invention except for wherein while the source user authenticator is receiving the submitted password from the user, capturing the password provided by the user in response to the source authenticator prompting and using the captured password as the received password.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to wherein while the source user authenticator is receiving the submitted password from the user, capturing the password provided by the user in response to the source authenticator prompting and using the captured password as the received password since it is known in the art to use the password provided by the user in response to the source authenticator prompting and using the captured password as the received password.

As per claim 10:

Van Dyke does not expressly show wherein the target datastore is an LDAP compliant directory service. However, Van Dyke does disclose about replicating accounts from source domain to target domain. Fig. 5, 102c. The difference between the prior art and the application is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The migrating steps would be performed the same regardless of the type of datastore involved. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of

patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the type of datastore compatible with their system because the type of datastore does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the datastore does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per claim 11:

Van Dyke does not expressly show wherein the target datastore is a relational database. However, Van Dyke does disclose about replicating accounts from source domain to target domain. Fig. 5, 102c. The difference between the prior art and the application is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The migrating steps would be performed the same regardless of the type of datastore involved. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the type of datastore compatible with their system because the type of datastore does not functionally relate to the steps in the

method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the datastore does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per claims 12 and 13:

Van Dyke does not expressly show wherein the source datastore is a relational database. However, Van Dyke does disclose about replicating accounts from source domain to target domain. Fig. 5, **102c**. The difference between the prior art and the application is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The migrating steps would be performed the same regardless of the type of datastores involved. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the type of datastore compatible with their system because the type of data stores does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data stores does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per claim 14:

Van Dyke further discloses:

wherein the user is a person. Col. 16, lines 55-62.

As per claim_15:

Van Dyke further discloses:

wherein the user is a software object. Col. 16, lines 55-62.

As per claim 19:

Van Dyke discloses:

intercepting a request to the source user authenticator from a user seeking access to information protected by the target user authenticator; Col. 16, lines 55-67. prompting the user for an identification; receiving the identification from the user. Col. 16, lines 55-67.

locating the corresponding identification in the target datastore and determining whether the target datastore includes a password associated with the identification; Col. 17, lines 1-20

if the target datastore does include a password associated with the identification, then: authenticating the identification and password using the target user using the target user authenticator. Col. 7, lines 15-20.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 571-272-6707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Daniel L. Greene
Examiner
Art Unit 3621